

Committee of the Whole Meeting
Monday, March 24, 2008
6:30pm
Town Hall
10 N High Street

Minutes

Call to order: Mr. Deeds called the meeting to order at 6:32pm

Roll Call:	John Bender	Rick Deeds	Bruce Jarvis
	Bobbie Mershon	Victor Paini	Marilyn Rush-Ekelberry
	Leah Turner		

Agenda Items:

Update of Job Description for Building Official, per the State Residential Building Code - Allan Neimayer

Mr. Neimayer stated that the job description of what is currently the "Building Inspector" needs to be changed to the "Building Official" per State Residential Building Code. This official will administer the rules of the Board of Building Standards, as well as the code itself. A certified Building Official is also qualified to review residential plans. This was built into the last Building Services contract to bring in-house. Mr. Neimayer passed out a document with the job description and qualifications of the Building Official. There are some changes to the qualifications. An architect or engineer would be qualified to be a Building Official, as well as, someone with 5 years experience with inspection work and plans examination. New special requirements include certification from the State and a valid driver's license. Other items in the job description remain the same.

The Building Official must be reported to the State each year to remain in compliance.

Mr. Neimayer requested a sponsor for this legislation. Mrs. Rush-Ekelberry agreed.

Mr. Paini asked if there would still be a Building Inspector and a Building Official. Mr. Neimayer clarified that there would only be a Building Official that would also do the inspections.

Amendment to Chapter 157, requested by the Landmarks Commission
-Allan Neimayer

The original Landmarks Ordinance was adopted in 1983. It set up the time for appeals of a Landmarks decision to Village Council as 10 days. In 1991, the ordinance was

rewritten and the time for appeals was increased from 10 to 30 days. In October of last year, a motion was passed to ask Council to amend Chapter 157 and bring the appeal time frame back to the original 10 days.

These changes also include adding back in the public notification process of the 1983 ordinance that was removed in the 1991 revision. (Paragraph B)

Voting requirement for Council to override a Landmarks decision will be changed from super majority to simple majority. (Paragraph C)

Mrs. Mershon agreed to sponsor the amendment.

Update on the Commercial Development Standards

-Allan Neimayer

Mr. Neimayer highlighted information from a packet that was distributed to Council.

1. Smaller buildings (of less than 10,000 sq. ft.) must have a pitched roof.
2. Four-sided architecture will be firmly addressed in the code.
3. Building massing will allow for different setbacks from the building line depending on the size of the building. This will allow for flexibility for a less stagnant look.

Mr. Paini asked if the staggering will allow some buildings to have parking in the front. Mrs. Rush-Ekelberry and Mrs. Mershon agreed that there should be no parking in the front, to keep a much cleaner look. Mr. Neimayer assured that this does not allow for parking in the front of the buildings.

4. Individual parking spaces will be limited within the parking bays and the bays must be separated by a green space.

Mr. Jarvis noted that to ease the flow of traffic proactively, the green space islands should be moved back from the moving lanes, in order to create enough room for turning into parking areas.

Mr. Neimayer showed where that issue is addressed in the power point presentation.

5. More lighting standards are added.
6. Parking in the rear of the building was addressed again.

Mr. Neimayer stated that they are working toward getting all the parking in the rear, though they are not always successful.

Mrs. Rush-Ekelberry asked why it can't just be part of the code/ building restrictions.

Mr. Neimayer stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission starts with that concept, the developer usually starts with the opposite concept and they meet in the middle.

Mr. Strayer clarified that there are some building issues with having the parking solely in the rear of the building. That essentially gives the building two front doors. The guests will not walk around to the door that faces the street. This also then eliminated a "back door" for the business, so that the dumpsters and deliveries are essentially in the front of

the business. These are issues that can be addressed, but they are bothersome to the developers and business owners.

7. Sign standards will be in place with regards separation of signage.
8. Utilities will be located in the rear of the building and also having the color scheme match the building.
9. No more dry basins for storm water detention. They will either be wet basins or a mix of a wet/dry basin with plant life and foliage in them so that they are attractive when they are dry.

A discussion of what type of plant life would be used ensued. Mr. Paini stated that he would rather see a wet basin. The foliage is not enough and it will still look like the basin in front of the elementary schools, which is not attractive when dry. Whenever possible, Mr. Paini believes a wet basin should be used.

Ms. Osborn clarified that a rain garden has many blooming plants, plants that are green year-round, and when properly maintained, are very beautiful.

Mr. Paini asked for a picture to be brought in to help them visualize the possibility.

Mr. Deeds asked who is responsible for maintaining the rain garden. Ms. Osborn stated that the property owner will have to maintain the plants and added that most landscaping companies that are employed by these businesses are adept at maintaining rain gardens.

Mayor Ebert asked if these would be used in residential areas as well. Mr. Neimayer said that it could, however, that with the size of residential developments, they will be able to use the wet basins. Mayor Ebert has concerns with the safety of children around wet basins in residential areas. Mr. Neimayer noted that the wet basins try to be very shallow with very gradual gradation to address this.

Mrs. Mershon asked about the requirements on businesses to maintain their landscaping. Mr. Neimayer stated that the developer is required to maintain it. Mrs. Mershon asked to whom then the dead trees in the parking lot islands are reported. Mr. Neimayer answered that Code Enforcement should and has been trying to deal with that. He also added that Gender Road needs to be looked at as a whole and brought up to standards.

Update on 2010 Census addressing review

-Allan Neimayer

Since December of 2007, Mr. Neimayer and Diane Mays have been working on an address census and have a 60 page spreadsheet at this time. This has been a large project, as the last census did not include Ashbrook, parts of Villages of Westchester and portions of other areas of Canal.

Mr. Jarvis asked what our approximate census is right now. Mr. Neimayer stated that it is about 6500.

Mrs. Mershon asked what type of changes will come with reporting that number since that will make Canal Winchester a city in 2010.

Ms. Osborn stated that employees will have to be hired through the Civil Service Commission, it will change the finding and responsibilities for maintaining state highways. Many funding formulas will change. The Charter has already dealt with many of the issues that would have changed if there were no charter.

Mr. Paini asked if the Charter Review Committee needs to be reinitiated prior to 2010. Ms. Osborn noted that that would not be necessary.

Briefing on the KCDG development project at Diley and Busey Road

Allan Neimayer

Mr. Neimayer spoke about and referred to a power point presentation highlighting the development project and discussion of the map ensued.

Parks Planning

-Rick Deeds

Mr. Peoples brought an inventory of our parks. Mrs. Mershon believes that Safety Committee should head up park planning and could work along with John Garrett and Bob Garvin.

Mrs. Turner asked if the park plan from about 1 ½ years ago is part of this new plan.

Mr. Deeds believes that in the past, issues have been dealt with as they have arisen; however, there has been no formal plan and overview for the future.

Mayor Ebert stated that there needs to be an entire picture of how the Village of Canal Winchester is going to expand overall before deciding where and how to develop parks.

Mrs. Mershon agreed and noted that there first needs to be a list of what areas are even appropriate for building parks. There also needs to be priority list of what needs to be done, so that applications for grants may be submitted if available. She added that this needs to encompass more than just the Recreation Board, for example, planning a dog park and passive exercise areas.

Mr. Strayer noted that there is very little private undeveloped land within the Village of Canal Winchester anymore as the boundaries are now. He stated that having a future land use plan with regards to annexations and boundaries is very important and should be done as soon as possible, so that we are not behind the eight ball when new development opportunities arise.

Mr. Strayer added that he believes Mrs. Mershon is looking at an even bigger picture, of environmental aspects, recreation, development policies and transportation issues... basically a Comprehensive Plan update and he agrees that this is probably the right time to start looking into that.

Mayor Ebert has been in contact with several people lately with regards to the big picture of future land use and annexations and has tried to start a Committee to look into these issues.

Mr. Jarvis adds that the bigger you are, the more it takes to maintain. Mr. Jarvis hopes that annexation isn't entered into just because we think we need more parks. He is confused if the discussion is about taking current holding and discussing their use, or whether the discussion is about adding to current holdings.

Mr. Jarvis questions whether we should be looking at the big picture first and working back down, or should we start where we are and work upward.

Mr. Strayer believes that it should definitely be working from the big picture down. Mr. Jarvis noted that that way is a huge undertaking.

Ms. Osborn advises that it needs to be top-down and bottom-up simultaneously if it is to be done correctly. If you do not know where you need to spend your money on current parks, you cannot know how your impact will be on the greater picture. In the past, each plan has been undertaken independently and not in connection with any other planning within the Village. Recently, is the first time that the CIP has attempted to be tied to other plans within the Village of Canal Winchester and it has worked out well.

Mr. Jarvis stated that it is time to do it.

Ms. Osborn agreed, but added that it may not be something to take on in 2008, but to work up to so that it can be addressed in 2009.

Mr. Paini believes that we should research bringing the Recreation Department into the Village, hiring a Director of Parks and Recreation and putting the pool and rec. programs in place. He adds that the Rec. Board does a nice job for children and the Village does a nice service for seniors, but there is a void for adults.

Mrs. Turner agreed that the Recreation Department and Village of Canal Winchester must be joined even if it takes a bond issue to get the money to do it.

Mrs. Mershon adds that the Rec. Department has money in the bank and they are not interested in putting on a bond issue until they need to.

Mrs. Turner stated it is because no one wants to take the time to deal with all that money.

Mr. Paini re-addresses the fact that it is because these are volunteers that run the Rec. Program, who have other full-time jobs. We need someone who can address these issues full-time.

Mrs. Mershon adds that she believes when the time comes that the Rec. Board needs money, they will put on a bond issue, but that time has not come.

Mr. Deeds agrees that a bond issue will generate money for parkland, but it is a deep subject and it should be one that is put in with the other issues to be addressed with the big picture.

Further discussion ensued regarding the Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Deeds stated that we need amenities to attract higher end businesses as well. Maybe, wireless access or other technology can go in the planning of the big picture.

Mr. Jarvis requested that we engage a few consultants to have some preliminary discussions and ask what their approach may be. Representatives from Administration, Rec. Board, School Board, Council, etc could be asked for their input to clarify what should be the first step.

Mr. Strayer suggests that the first step be to let Mr. Neimayer and he sit down and brainstorm issues and come back to Council with some talking points. The information generated from that discussion would then be able to be taken to the consultants for their input.

Other Business

Miracles and Magic event is April 4th and 5th. Invitations will be in mailboxes soon.

Ms. Osborn will send out a list of people requesting grant funding from Council on March 31st.

Mayor Ebert noted that Ed Snyder's mother passed away this weekend and anyone wishing to send condolences, should do so.

Adjourn Motion to adjourn by Dr. Bender, seconded by Mr. Paini.

VOTE:	AYES	Dr. Bender, Mr. Deeds, Mr. Jarvis, Ms. Mershon, Mr. Paini, Ms. Rush-Ekelberry, Ms. Turner
	NAYS	

Time Out: 8:01pm